

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

**REMARKS**

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, 11, 15 and 17 have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 11, 15 and 17 have been amended to further define the invention. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**1. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

**a. Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 11-20**

Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorsey et al. ("Dorsey," U.S. Patent No. 6,198,751). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 1, 8, 11, 15 and 17 have been amended to further define the invention.

Each of the amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 recite, among other limitations, a feature relating to a translator that includes a first translator terminal and a second translator terminal where the first and second translator terminals are in data communication with each other. Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a translator for use with a first wireless network and a second wireless network and recites:

...the translator including a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals of the first wireless network in the first encrypted format, the translator including a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals of the second wireless network in the second encrypted format or in the non-encrypted format, the first

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

translator terminal in data communication with the second translator terminal . . .

Amended independent claim 8 is directed to a method of communicating in a communication network including a first and a second secure wireless network, and recites:

translating selected data in the first format to translated data in the second format using a translator having a first translator terminal and a second translator terminal, the first translator terminal in data communication with the second translator terminal

Amended independent claim 15 is directed to a communication system and recites:

a translator means including a first translator terminal for communicating with the first means in the first encrypted format, a second translator terminal for communicating with the second terminals in the second encrypted format, the first translator terminal in data communication with the second translator terminal . . .

As discussed in the Specification, in an exemplary embodiment as shown in Figure 2, a translator 80 includes a terminal 82 coupled to a terminal 84 by a high speed data link 86, a blanking interface 88 and a timing interface 92. See, Specification, page 9, line 20 to page 10, line 4.

In contrast, Dorsey does not teach or suggest a translator for use with first and second wireless networks that includes a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals of the first wireless network in the first encrypted format, a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals of the second wireless network in the second encrypted format or in the non-encrypted format where the first translator terminal is in data communication with the second translator terminal. Rather, Dorsey discloses a multi-protocol packet translator unit that may be used for unidirectional or bidirectional translation. See, Figures 4A-4C, col. 6, lines 9-63. In one embodiment, two unidirectional translators 44, 45 that are not in data communication with each other are used to translate between two networks. See, Figure 4A, col. 6, lines 9-18 and 43-49. A first translator 44 translates packets sent from a first network 41 to a second network 42 and a second translator 45 translates packets sent from the second network 42 to the first network 41. See, Figure 4A,

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

col. 6, lines 9-18 and 43-49. Alternatively, Dorsey teaches that a single translator may be modified to provide bidirectional translation or translation between multiple networks. See, Figures 4B and 4C, col. 6, lines 19-42 and 50-63. As shown in Figures 4B and 4C of Dorsey, however, only a single translator unit 46, 47 is used.

Further, Dorsey does not does not disclose or identify the problem of integrating two or more secure wireless networks that utilize different encryption formats. Rather, as discussed above, Dorsey deals with providing a single multi-protocol translator that can translate multiple communication (or network) protocols. Dorsey is not concerned with problems encountered with communicating secured data in different formats. Accordingly, amended claims 1, 8 and 15 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2 and 7 depend from amended claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Dorsey for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1. Claim 7 further recites:

... a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in the third encrypted format. . .

Dorsey, however, does not teach or suggest a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with third terminals in the third encrypted format. In contrast, as discussed above, Dorsey teaches the use of a single translator 47 for use with multiple networks. See, Figure 4C, col. 6, lines 55-63. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner did not cite any reference or teaching for a translator with a third translator terminal as recited in claim 7. At page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states:

Claim 7: Dorsey does not specifically disclose translator communicating with third network in a third encrypted format. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that translator taught by Dorsey can accept data from different networks and further translator can analyze its data in different format.

The Examiner does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a "third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third encrypted format." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference showing a translator with a third

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third encrypted format under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claims 2 and 7 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 11-14 depend from amended claim 8 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 8 and are therefore allowable over Dorsey for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 8.

In addition, amended claim 11 further recites the translator has a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in the third format. As discussed above with respect to claim 7, Dorsey does not teach or suggest a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with third terminals in the third encrypted format. At page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states:

Claim 11: Dorsey does not specifically disclose translator communicating with third network in a third encrypted format. It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that translator taught in Dorsey can accept data from different networks and further translator can analyze its data in different formats.

The Examiner, however, does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a "third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third format." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference showing a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third format under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claims 11-14 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 16-20 depend from amended claim 15 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 15 and are therefore allowable over Dorsey for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 15.

In addition, amended claim 17 further recites the translator means includes a third translator terminal for communicating with the third means in the third format. As discussed above with respect to claims 7 and 11, Dorsey does not teach or suggest a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with third terminals in the third encrypted format. At page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states:

-9-

IN THE UNITED  
STATES PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

Claims 16, 17: . . . Dorsey does not specifically disclose translator communicating with third network in a third encrypted format. It would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that translator taught in Ranger can accept data from different networks and further translator can analyze its data in different format.

The Examiner, however, does not provide any teaching or suggestion for a "third translator terminal for communicating with the third means in a third format." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite a reference showing a translator with a third translator terminal communicating with the third terminals in a third format under MPEP 2144.03. Accordingly, claims 16-20 are believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 7-8 and 11-20 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-2, 7-8 and 11-20 is respectfully requested.

**b. Claims 5-6 and 9-10**

Claims 5-6 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorsey in view of Ahmadi et al. ("Ahmadi, U.S. Patent No. 6,597,671). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 5-6 depend from amended claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Dorsey in view of Ahmadi for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1. Claims 9-10 depend from amended claim 8 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 8 and are therefore allowable over Dorsey in view of Ahmadi for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 8. Accordingly, claims 5-6 and 9-10 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 5-6 and 9-10 is respectfully requested.

**c. Claims 3-4**

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorsey in view of Frink ("Frink, U.S. Patent No. 4,870,571). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 3-4 depend from amended claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

amended claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Dorsey in view of Frink for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-4 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 3-4 is respectfully requested.

## 2. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 19, 2003

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.  
400 Collins Road, NE  
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-8280  
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777  
Customer No.: 26383

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kyle Epple  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,155